

REMARKS

The claims have been amended as discussed at the interview. Support for hydrogen peroxide as the indicator is found in the specification in paragraph 16, where hydrogen peroxide is generated and interacts with NBD. No new matter has been added and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

The only outstanding basis for rejection is under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant understands, by virtue of the discussion at the interview, that Morris has successfully been distinguished by the amendment to the claim. Applicant believes that the claims as previously worded also distinguish Morris because they reflected a physical interaction which involved an intermolecular collision as explained in the attachment to the previous response, but are gratified that the claims as presently worded are understood to make this distinction. Clearly Morris does not prevent the emission of light by the fluorescent moiety as it is said to be emitted through the reaction mixture.

It was indicated at the interview that although Morris is distinguished, the Office believes that other anticipatory references could be found. Applicant is unable to distinguish these as they are not present at this time.

As the only outstanding rejection has been obviated, passage of claims 1, 4 and 13-14 to issue is respectfully requested.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket No. 527832000420.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 28, 2008

By: / Kate H. Murashige /
Kate H. Murashige
Registration No.: 29,959
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5112